



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

sults of the investigations of such men as Loménie and Stern, supplementing their work by a first-hand knowledge of such material as is found in the *Mémoires* of Montigny, the correspondence of Mirabeau with La Marck and others, Mirabeau's notes to the Court, and his speeches. It is a work of condensation and not of original research. But to condense the life of Mirabeau into two hundred and thirty pages is a difficult task and Mr. Willert has performed it in a highly creditable manner. The proportions are good and the division into chapters shows excellent judgment. The latter part of the work is, to my mind, better than the first part. It shows a firmer grasp of the subject and more unity in the treatment of it. In the first part, not sufficient emphasis is laid upon the fact that the period from 1750 to 1789 in French history was characterized by the crystallization of public opinion in opposition to arbitrary power and that nearly everything that Mirabeau wrote during these years shows him to have been one of the most persistent and consistent advocates of this opposition. Mr. Willert is sympathetic in his treatment of Mirabeau, but it has seemed to me that now and then he is unfair in his treatment of the Revolution (p. 105).

Good as it is, the book is naturally not without defects. There is lack of uniformity in the treatment of French expressions ; there are some obscure passages due to too great condensation or to the failure to follow the order of events, and there are some—not many—inaccuracies. The chief defect, as it appears to me, is the lack at times of sufficient background. How much background an historical work should contain is, of course, a matter of judgment, but I believe that the conservative critic would agree with me that Mr. Willert has not always given his Mirabeau a satisfactory setting.

The style of the book is most attractive, although at times (pp. 92, 229) the similes are considerably overdone. One of the most striking sentences that I recall is taken from a description of Mirabeau in the Assembly (p. 87) : "His rough-hewn features and shaggy locks were suited, like the mask of an ancient actor, for distant effect." Could Macaulay have done better?

FRED MORROW FLING.

*Histoire du Second Empire.* Par PIERRE DE LA GORCE. Tome Quatrième. (Paris : E. Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 1899. Pp. 642.)

THIS is the fourth volume of the well-known work of M. de la Gorce on the Second Empire, and there are two more volumes to come. The period discussed is that from 1860 to 1866 and the volume contains not only an admirable account of that tumultuous and exciting era in French politics which culminated in the elections of 1863, but also long and practically complete chapters on the Mexican expedition, the Polish insurrection, and the whole Schleswig-Holstein affair leading to the Danish and Austro-Prussian wars.

The present volume brings out with exceptional clearness the chang-

ing conditions under which the Second Empire entered upon the second decade of its history, passing from the "simple and majestic unity" of the earlier years to the "great confusion" of the later; from the era of easy government to that of an administration confronted by manifold complications. "Ce fut la fatalité du Second Empire," says M. de la Gorce, "que les complications, les *questions* (comme le public prit l'habitude de les appeler) se succéderent les unes aux autres sans laisser aux acteurs ou au spectateurs de la politique un seul instant de trêve ou de repos. À la *question d'Orient* avait succédé la *question italienne*; la question italienne été remplacée par la *question polonaise*: l'affaire de Pologne absorbait encore les esprits, et voici que surgissait la *question danoise*, conflit restreint en apparence, mais où toute l'Allemagne se passionnerait, où toute l'Europe prendrait parti, et où se verrait, dans un cadre moins tragique, l'image rapetissée de toutes les grandes violences qui s'accompliraient plus tard" (p. 468).

M. de la Gorce is, therefore, giving us something more than the tragedy of the Second Empire; he is in reality telling the history of western Europe during six important years of diplomacy and intrigue. In but one chapter is he upon the soil of France; in the others he is in Mexico, Poland, and Germany, just as in the earlier volumes he spent a large proportion of time in the Crimea, Italy, Syria, and China. In the present volume he devotes a third of his space to the Mexican difficulty. This seems excessive, the more so inasmuch as many of the negotiations of 1866 are passed over with but little comment. It is a disappointment to discover Napoleon's dealings with Austria disposed of in a few paragraphs, and Bismarck's famous proposal of June 10 dismissed most summarily in six lines, particularly when we remember how much space was allotted to the movements of the French army from Vera Cruz to Mexico.

On disputed questions M. de la Gorce is on the whole conservative. There is no evidence of partisanship in his attitude toward Germany, though he is severe in his judgment of Bismarck, and is inclined to depend on Benedetti (*Ma Mission en Prusse*) and La Marmora (*Un Peu Plus de Lumière*) rather more than upholders of Bismarck will like. He acquits Napoleon of duplicity in 1866 and seems to accept his letter of June 12 to Drouyn de Lhuys as a true explanation of the imperial policy; and he explains Napoleon's concurrent negotiations with Austria and Prussia as due to the Emperor's avowed determination to preserve an even balance between the two powers that he might be competent after war had actually broken out to play the part of impartial mediator (p. 614).

As was the case with the earlier volumes so here we find no especially authoritative utterance due to the discovery of any new material. M. de la Gorce has made no such contribution to history as have Stern and Von Sybel. He is a skillful and careful co-ordinator, using impartially and impersonally the extant printed materials and presenting his conclusions with exceptional lucidity and charm of style. His work de-

serves to be translated, for it will be when finished unquestionably the ablest history of the period from 1850 to 1870 that we possess now or are likely to possess in the near future.

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

*Histoire de la Troisième République. La Présidence de Jules Grévy.*

Par E. ZEVORT, Recteur de l'Académie de Caen. (Paris : Félix Alcan. 1898. Pp. 546.)

THIS third volume of M. Zevort's history of the French Republic covers the nine years of Grévy's presidency, from January, 1879, to December, 1887. The period is less exciting, and to the general public less interesting, than those treated in M. Zevort's earlier volumes, but to the student who wants to understand the real working of the present French government, it is far more important. The heroic period of the Republic had ended, and the enthusiasm that greeted its birth had faded into the light of common day ; but for that very reason the history of the time furnishes a genuine test of the existing political institutions. M. Zevort's work supplies, therefore, a real want, for it gives us a narrative of current politics under the Republic which cannot be found in a convenient form elsewhere. It is not a philosophic study of the times, but a narrative of political events, a history of the succession of short-lived ministries, their struggles in the chambers, the measures they carried, and the causes of their fall. While the author lays a proper stress on the great laws on education, the press, public meeting, etc., passed during the earlier years of this period, he may be criticized as being too conscientious, as mentioning too many of the bills brought before the chambers. He has a little tendency to cram the book full of detail, and thereby injure its perspective, but while this makes the work somewhat less interesting to the general reader, it is none the less valuable to the student.

Although M. Zevort is, on the whole, cautious in his judgment of men, he lets us see very clearly that he has not a high opinion of President Grévy's character. He attributes the lack of party discipline and the consequent instability of cabinets in no small part to the President's jealousy of public men, and especially of those leaders who belonged to the same wing of the Republican party as he, and consequently whose political opinions were, on the whole, most nearly like his own. To this jealousy, M. Zevort attributes the failure of Gambetta to become chief of the first ministry after Grévy's election ; and, in his opinion, that failure was a permanent source of harm. The real leader of the majority ought, of course, to be at the head of the ministry, and he thinks that his absence from that position made party discipline impossible. The President's jealousy was not limited to Gambetta, and did not cease on his death, but extended to the leaders who succeeded him, and especially to Ferry, whom the author looks upon as the next greatest figure to Gambetta in the Republican ranks. He thinks that Ferry did not have the